

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 11-14, 16, 17 and 19 are pending in this application. Claims 11 and 12 are independent. The remaining claims depend directly from claim 11 or 12.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11-14, 16, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,791,703 issued to Maeda *et al.* (hereinafter “Maeda”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,952 issued to Olbricht (hereinafter “Olbricht”) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 issued to Vankatraman *et al.* (hereinafter “Vankatraman”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

One or more embodiments of the present invention are directed to a printing method in which a printer sends page data for a print acceptance screen to a computer when another printer for printing does not have a function to provide the print acceptance screen (*see* Publication of the Specification, paragraphs [0056] and [0060]). Accordingly, independent claims 11 and 12 recite, in part, “wherein a computer displays a print acceptance screen based on page data sent from a first network printer on a network.”

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), the Examiner must show that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Applicant respectfully asserts that whether considered separately or in combination, Maeda, Olbricht and Vankatraman do not show or suggest all of the limitations of independent claim 11 or 12.

The Examiner alleges that Maeda shows a client 9 displaying an operating screen based on webpage URL data sent from www-server 10 (*see* Office Action dated January 25, 2007, at page 2). However, in contrast to independent claims 11 and 12, Maeda, Olbricht and Vankatraman fail to show or suggest, “wherein a computer displays a print acceptance screen based on page data sent from a first network printer on a network.”

In fact, Maeda clearly shows that the client 9 displays the operating screen based on the print utility installed in the client 9, not sent from the www-server 10. Specifically, Maeda shows that the www-server 10 shown in Maeda is an apparatus accessed by a digital copier 1 for the “Web Pull Print” function, *i.e.*, an apparatus that holds HTML data for printing (*see* Maeda, column 6, lines 45-47). Also, Maeda shows that the print utility is installed in the client 9 (*see* Maeda, column 6, lines 59-61). That is, the www-server 10 clearly does not send any data for displaying an operating screen to the client 9 and the print utility is not sent from the www-server 10.

Further, the Examiner does not point to any specific aspect of Maeda which shows or suggests, “wherein a computer displays a print acceptance screen based on page data sent from a first network printer on a network,” as required by independent claims 11 and 12. However, “when the PTO asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must indicate where such teaching or suggestion appears in the reference” (*see In re Rijckaert*,

28 USPQ 2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Therefore, the pending Office Action has failed to establish that Maeda shows or suggests these limitations required by independent claims 11 and 12.

In addition, as explained in the previous response dated October 26, 2006, Olbricht is completely silent with respect to the feature that a computer displays a print acceptance screen based on page data sent from a first network printer on a network. Rather, Olbricht expressly teaches away from this feature. This is evidenced by the fact that Olbricht expressly shows that a browser retrieves an HTML-format page from the scanner, not from a first network printer (*see* Olbricht, column 3, lines 26-27). Indeed, a *prima facie* case of obviousness may be rebutted by showing that the art, in any material respect, teaches away from the claimed invention (*see* MPEP § 2145.05).

Finally, Vankatraman is also completely silent with respect to the feature that a computer displays a print acceptance screen based on page data sent from a first network printer on a network, as required by independent claims 11 and 12. In fact, Vankatraman is directed to a network interface in a device which enables access to a web page by a web browser such that a user of the web browser accesses the user interface functions for the device through the web page (*see* Vankatraman, Abstract). Vankatraman merely shows that the device is a wide variety of devices including devices such as printers (*see* Vankatraman, column 3, lines 49-50). Thus, Vankatraman also provides no showing or suggestion regarding a computer displaying a print acceptance screen based on page data sent from a first network printer on a network, as required by independent claims 11 and 12.

In view of above, Maeda, Olbricht and Vankatraman, whether taken separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the invention as recited in independent claims 11 and 12.

Thus, independent claims 11 and 12 are patentable over Maeda, Olbricht and Vankatraman. Claims 13, 14 and 19, directly dependent from claim 11, and claims 16 and 17, directly dependent from 12, are allowable for at least same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591, Reference 04783/012002.

Dated: April 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant